

# COURT MINUTES OF STATUS CONFERENCE

---

ALVIN BALDUS, CARLENE BECHEN,  
ELVIRA BUMPUS, RONALD BIENDSEI,  
LESLIE W DAVIS, III, BRETT ECKSTEIN,  
GEORGIA ROGERS, RICHARD KRESBACH,  
ROCHELLE MOORE, AMY RISSEEUW,  
JUDY ROBSON, JEANNE SANCHEZ-BELL,  
CECELIA SCHLIEPP, TRAVIS THYSSEN, *and*  
CINDY BARBERA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CASE NO. 11-CV-0562

*Members of the Wisconsin Government  
Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity:  
MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER,  
GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE,  
THOMAS BARLAND, TIMOTHY VOCKE, and  
KEVIN KENNEDY, director and general counsel  
for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,*

Defendants.

---

**THREE JUDGE PANEL,  
DIANE WOOD, Circuit Judge,  
ROBERT DOW, District Judge, and  
J. P. STADTMUELLER, District Judge,  
PRESIDING**

DATE:	October 24, 2011	TIME SCHEDULED:	8:30 a.m.
COURT DEPUTY/CLERK:	Zachary Willenbrink	TIME CALLED:	8:34 a.m.
COURT REPORTER:	Sheryl Stawski	TIME FINISHED:	8:47 a.m.
PURPOSE:	Status Conference		
PLAINTIFF BY:	Brady C. Williamson (appearing by phone) Rebecca K. Mason (appearing by phone)		
DEFENDANT BY:	Steve Means (appearing by phone, on behalf of Maria S. Lazar)		

---

Notes:

- 8:34 a.m. Appearances: Judges Wood and Dow appear by phone; Plaintiffs' attorneys, Brady Williamson and Rebecca Mason, appear by phone; Defendants' attorney, Steve Means, appears by phone
- 8:35 Court recounts history of case, discusses time constraints and need to adjudicate this case by February or March
- 8:36 Plaintiffs agree that the case should be adjudicated by March 15, 2012, at the latest; note that partisan primary will likely be moved up; request that answer be filed within 14 days; state that there will likely need to be discovery and testimony
- 8:38 Defendants agree that the Court's suggested timing; note that Ms. Lazar is absent and currently unreachable
- 8:39 Judge Wood asks how long discovery will take
- 8:39 Defendant responds that there is likely a great deal of discovery needed; Plaintiff states that there will need to be expert witnesses called
- 8:39 Judge Dow states that he has nothing to add at this point
- 8:40 Plaintiff requests that Court set a date
- 8:40 Court suggests that Plaintiff set up meeting with Defendants to establish a joint scheduling order, which takes into account expert witnesses; Court also suggests the parties attempt to reach an agreed-upon set of facts; Court also states that major discovery disputes should be avoided, and notes case in Northern District of Illinois (11-CV-5065)—a situation the Court would like to avoid
- 8:43 Court states that, if the case is going to go to trial, the Court suggests either March 19 or March 26 for a trial date; the Court will not set that date today, though, and would like the parties to agree upon a date after Ms. Lazar becomes available; Court states that the first action that the parties should complete is creation of a joint scheduling order
- 8:45 Plaintiffs and Defendants agree that they will do so
- 8:45 Court reiterates that the parties are responsible for creation of a joint scheduling order, which shall be due by the end of this week
- 8:46 Plaintiff asks whether electronic filing will be sufficient, or whether paper copies will be required to certain judges
- 8:46 Judge Stadtmueller states that electronic copies are sufficient for his chambers; Judge Wood and Judge Dow both agree to review filings electronically, unless there is some difficulty in accessing those documents, in which case the judges' chambers will contact the parties to coordinate the submission of paper copies
- 8:46 Judge Stadtmueller states that, should the parties have any logistical questions or problems, they should contact Zach Willenbrink, the clerk assigned to this case in Judge Stadtmueller's chambers
- 8:47 Court stands in recess